

represented in their National Council, cast off the last vestiges of Russian imperialism, and declared themselves independent. This took great courage, for the Russian army was doing everything in its power to maintain control of Estonia. But the Estonian people knew their rightful heritage. They were a distinct and advanced people, deserving national self-determination.

That day 46 years ago was the most important in Estonian history. It started a remarkable improvement economically, in agriculture and industry, and it also started an improvement in Estonia that was really astounding, in education and in many other ways, as this new, small democracy developed.

Independence started Estonia on 22 years of amazing progress under democracy. Agricultural production expanded tremendously as agrarian reform gave land to the peasants for the first time in centuries. Estonia soon was self-sufficient in food, and even more, exported great amounts of butter, potatoes, and grain. The 52,000 farms of 1919, owned by the German, state, and church monopolies, became 140,000 small family farms. As always private farm ownership led to the greatest production of food in the nation's history. No one went hungry in Estonia before the war.

Industry grew markedly during those years of independence. Oil deposits were discovered and developed. Peat, phosphates, lumber, woodpulp and paper, building materials, and many other products were produced by Estonians for their comfort and happiness.

The economic boom was supplemented by a major explosion of cultural progress. Education was developed to the fullest. Illiteracy was reduced to about 3 percent, including many illiterate Russian refugees. Schools were constructed at an impressive rate, and nearly every school-age child in Estonia had access to education. The University of Tartu was a center of learning, with almost 3,000 students, a library of 660,000 books, and a large faculty of noted educators. Music, art, and cultural pursuits of all kinds flourished. This was quite an achievement for a small nation of little more than a million people. In short, it was quite obvious that the Estonian people were devoted to freedom. By their hard work and talents they created a new Estonia, progressive and independent, with every chance of greater improvement in the future.

But we know that this chance was destroyed by the Communists in 1940. The greed of the Soviet Union in its restless search for new peoples to conquer brought untold misery to the 6 million people in the Baltic nations. In an age when every self-respecting nation should have been trying to set an example in opposition to Nazi degeneracy, the Soviet Union chose instead to join in the merciless partition and subjection of peaceful peoples. The world has seldom seen such cynicism and hypocrisy from one nation as that evidenced by the Soviet Union in 1939 and 1940.

The Communists now think the world has forgotten Estonia. But we owe it to our fellow citizens from Estonia and to

free people everywhere not to ever forget what happened to Estonia. Every year on Estonian Independence Day, whether it be the 46th or the 100th, the people of the United States will send best wishes and hopes for freedom and happiness to the Estonian people. Let us hope especially that in the near future Estonia will receive these greetings as a free nation, able to accept them as a part of its own joyous celebration.

#### PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of February 20, 1964, pp. 3100-3101, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. The bill would provide for an authorization to assist in meeting the costs of the incoming President-elect and Vice President-elect, and also of the outgoing President and Vice President for a period of 6 months after the latter leave office.

The bill as it passed the House provided for an authorization of \$1,300,000. When it came to the Senate, we reduced the authorization to \$500,000. In the conference, after considerable discussion, we, in effect, split the difference between the House figure of \$1,300,000 and the Senate figure of \$500,000, and agreed upon an authorization of \$900,000.

In addition, we reduced the amount that could be approved on voucher from 20 percent to 10 percent of the total amount to be authorized. This would relate to those matters which the President-elect decided involved costs related to what we termed classified and essential to the national security. Originally, the bill provided that the President-elect and the Vice President-elect merely needed to certify the costs as confidential. The conference language holds that they must be classified and essential to the national security. Those are the two principal amendments that were agreed upon in the conference to resolve the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that I voted against the bill. I hope I am not penurious in my approach to any program to provide for the President and Vice President. It is utterly unrealistic and excessive ident of the United States. It seems to

to allow \$900,000 to be expended between the election of the President and Vice President in November and their taking office in January.

We hear much talk these days about economy. Yet a program of this kind is presented to us, which provides a sum, beyond the salaries of the President and Vice President, for the support of those offices for a period of 6 or 8 weeks between the November election and the assumption of power about January 20.

Mr. President, when compared with the total budget, this is not a large sum of money. However, we should bear in mind that the budget is made up of thousands of items of this size or smaller items, and the sum total of them is what leads to such enormous spending.

More than that, Mr. President, proposals of this kind are somewhat of symbols as to the attitudes of Congress and the executive branch of the Government toward spending.

There are already a number of services which are available—particularly to the outgoing President. He is allowed a staff and a certain sum of money; and the incoming President receives a large number of services which are not reflected in or affected by this item—for example, Secret Service protection. He needs that, but that item appears elsewhere in the budget. There are a number of other perquisites which flow immediately to one who is elected President.

So it seems to me wholly unnecessary to provide almost \$1 million to take care of these activities from November until January.

I am aware of the fact that the national committees of the two parties are pressing very vigorously for the enactment of this proposed legislation. Heretofore, such sums as have been expended have generally been contributed by the Democratic National Committee or by the Republican National Committee, and I do not think it is improper to have some allowance made for these expenditures. For that reason, when the bill was before the Democratic Policy Committee, I suggested that the amount be reduced from \$1,300,000 to \$500,000; and that course was followed on the floor of the Senate, and the bill as passed by the Senate called for \$500,000. I think that sum would be ample to provide for these expenses over this period of time, for it amounts to more than \$125,000 a month. Although the demands are great, they do not even approach those which are made upon the time and the resources and the staff of one who actually has assumed the Presidency.

I think it becomes rather ridiculous when the newspapers herald the fact that the President is going around the White House, turning out the lights, and that the post offices are being darkened at night, to save money, and that we are going to return to the homespun quality of thrift, which we knew in our boyhood days, but then to have Congress provide \$900,000 of entirely new money, really for the relief of the treasury of the Republican National Committee in, perhaps, the year 1980 or the year 1985, or somewhere about then, and now for the relief of the Democratic National Com-

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3285

mittee and the other campaign committees. To me, that approaches irresponsibility; and I merely wish to have the RECORD show that I voted against it.

Mr. President, I do not seek to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on this question, because in my efforts to obtain some reason and some sanity in Government spending, I have found that about the best way to get run over hard is to advocate a reduction in expenses when one is serving in a Senate in which Members speak continually about economy. If a Senator really wants to get trampled under foot, let him just make a motion that expenditures of this sort be cut—such a motion in a Senate in which individual Senators rise each day and swear their allegiance to economy.

This provides too much money, and I regret it. I know the Senate conferees must have made an effort to defend the position taken by the Senate; but in my opinion the American taxpayers should not be taxed more than \$500,000 to take care of the expenses of the President-elect from the time of the election until the time when he assumes that office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee, let me assure the Senator from Georgia that I was highly in favor of a \$500,000 limitation. However, the Senator from Georgia knows that the House was in favor of a much larger amount; and in such a case, normally an attempt is made to strike a balance between the position taken by the House and the position taken by the Senate; and the balance was struck exactly between the amounts voted by the two Houses.

However, the Senator from Washington pointed out, in the conference, that this amount is a ceiling; it is not necessarily the amount of money that will be appropriated. This is an authorization bill; and the Appropriation Committees may not approve amounts up to the ceiling thus set. The expenditures may not come anywhere near that amount. So perhaps the Senator from Georgia and I will, later, have an opportunity together to do something about getting this amount back to the amount which we think it really should be.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished and able Senator from Iowa that after a bill which relates to what are in the category of housekeeping items is passed by Congress, thereafter a Member of Congress is considered guilty of lese majesty, if not a number of other things, if he attempts to interfere with expenditures in the White House—as would also be the case if a Member of the Senate attempted to interfere with expenses in the other body of Congress.

If I had been aware that splitting the difference would be the rule which would be followed on all occasions, I would have endeavored to have the Senate vote for \$100,000; and in that case, we would have been much better off, following the conference.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say there is in the bill an item which was of even greater

concern to me, and apparently it was also of great concern to other Senators, because the House version provided that up to 20 percent of this money could be spent for confidential items. The Senate rejected that provision, and deleted that portion of the bill, and did not feel that any of this money should be spent in a confidential way—with the result that the taxpayers would not know what was going on.

This question was raised in the conference. At my suggestion, we struck out the word "confidential," and inserted in lieu thereof the phrase "classified and are essential to the national security."

It seems to me that a newly elected President of the United States can be trusted, so that if he certifies that any of these expenditures are classified and are essential to the national security, we should be willing to recognize that perhaps there are some items which are indeed essential to the national security and should not be revealed. We already do that in the case of the President of the United States; and in the case of the President-elect, the feeling of the conferees was that this would be a desirable thing, and that an appropriate safeguard was placed on it.

The House version provided for up to 20 percent of these items. It was agreed that that percentage would be cut to 10 percent; and it was our feeling that with that 10 percent reduction, plus the limitation I have mentioned, the interests of the Senate would be amply served.

As I have said, I have reservations regarding the amount. I would have preferred \$500,000. However, I think we still will have an opportunity, at the time when the Appropriations Committee makes its report on this item, to reduce it; and if there are good reasons for reducing it, I am sure we shall do so. And if there are not good reasons for requesting the Appropriations Committee to vote in favor of an appropriations of \$900,000, I am sure that committee will not recommend \$900,000, either.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]—they can get along with well under the \$900,000 figure.

I desire to point out that we feel that this is definitely a ceiling; and in my judgment—speaking only for myself, although I am sure I also speak for the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]—they can get along with well under the \$900,000 figure.

The House took an adamant position on the \$1,300,000; and the result—\$900,000—was a pure compromise, nothing else.

I also wish to point out that this authorization includes the costs of the outgoing President and Vice President for a period of 6 months from January 20 of the year in which they leave office. I think it is a rather improper business for the national committees of both national parties to pay the costs of an incoming President and an incoming Vice President in connection with matters that relate directly to their responsibilities and duties as President and Vice-President-elect. I do not believe the

political parties should be involved in that sort of thing.

Obviously, this program must be kept within bounds. I wish to make the record clear that we in the Congress should scrutinize very carefully the requests for funds in this regard, because there is no reason in the world why the entire job, affecting the President-elect, the Vice-President-elect, and the outgoing President and Vice President, cannot be done for a sum much less than the \$900,000 figure. Therefore, I would like the record to show that it was with great reluctance that the \$900,000 figure was agreed upon.

It was only in the interest of getting the proposed legislation passed that that figure turned out to be \$900,000. We would expect that years hence—of course, many years—when funds are made available, they would be scrutinized very carefully; and that this job could be done for a sum very substantially less than the amount authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I call attention to the strong possibility that the conference report on the tax bill may well be considered tomorrow afternoon.

I have discussed the question of the four treaties on the Executive Calendar with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and there is a strong possibility that they will come up and perhaps be voted on shortly after 2 p.m. tomorrow.

The bill (S. 2136) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, Calendar No. 851, may be brought up tomorrow provided it is cleared all around and that not too much in the way of debate will be required in view of the other possibilities inherent in the session on Tuesday.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Can the Senator outline for us the likelihood of the civil rights bill coming before the Senate? Will it be brought before the Senate following consideration of the bill relating to the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938? When I was out of the Chamber, I understand that objection was made to the consideration of the cotton and wheat bill. I wondered what the plan of the leadership was and how that plan would impinge on the civil rights bill.